#### IN THE LINITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

09/748.716 Confirmation No. 5358 Appl. No.

Sara Elo DEAN et al. Applicant

Filed December 22, 2000 TC/A II 2173 Evaminer Brian J. DETWILER Docket No. POUG920000205US1

Customer No. : 23334

1970-01-01 12:12

# 37 C.F.R. 1.131 DECLARATION

I. each and every one of the undersigned inventors of the above-referenced patent application, hereby declare the following:

- 1) Claims 1-9, 11-31, and 33-39 in our above-identified patent application were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and claims 10 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0085020 A1 to Carroll, Jr., entitled "XML-Based Graphical User Interface Application Development Toolkit filed on September 14, 2001, with a priority date of September 14, 2000 ("Carroll").
- 21 The Invention described in the above-referenced patent application was reduced to a writing prior to the September 14, 2000 priority date of Carroll. In particular, Franklin Content Management Prototype documentation (exhibit A), upon which the above referenced patent application was based, is attached herewith. The documentation is a comprehensive specification and Installation of the inventive system (see the table of contents of this document for the full detail) created and used by the inventors prior to the September 14, 2000 priority date of Carroll and demonstrating features of the presently claimed invention. It includes everything from an Installation guide, configuration, setup of the DB and a Franklin workspace for content management, setting up of users, roles, and includes code snippets of communication between components and error codes.
- Additionally, the invention described in the above-referenced patent application 31 was reduced to actual practice prior to the September 14, 2000 priority date of Carroll. Proof of actual reduction to practice upon which the presently claimed invention was based is attached herewith and will be described in detail below.
- 4) Submitted herewith as evidence of actual reduction to practice prior to the September 14, 2000 priority date of Carroll are the following exhibits:
  - Exhibit B) Assignments passed out to users prior to the September 14, 2000 priority date of Carroll to test users who were evaluating the integration between two systems: the present invention and

users.

PATENT

"Kittyhaw't prior, to the September 14, 2000 priority date of Carroll. The scenarios aske users to do different eclions in the present invention's UI, which would show that there was a running system that could support users <u>prior to</u> the September 14, 2000 priority date of Carroll. The document describes the integration of the two systems, and shows the request/responses part of the communication between the two systems.

- Exhibit C) A copy of a State chart of the invention's DB with each possible state of a fragment when stored in the invention's DB. The State chart was created and used by the inventiors <u>prict</u> ptie September 14, 2000 priority date of Carroll and demonstrates features of the organity datamed invention.
- Exhibit D Copies of HTML pages created by the inventors <u>prior</u> to the Soptember 14, 2000 priority date of Carroll and demonstrating features of the presently claimed invention. The HTML pages describe to users how to install the inventive claim and issue commands to manage documents, such as Check in, Check out, relew, publish and describes the featuremarkerstable relationship to
- Exhibit E) A synthesis of all feetback from a user acceptance testing of the common, non prior, to the Sospenber 14, 2000 priority date of Carroll. It includes a list of things users liked and did not like, which evidences that users were using the running end-o-end inventive system with features of the presently claimed invention prior to the Sentember 14, 2000 ordinary date of Carroll.
- Exhibit F) A copy of brief notes identified during a code review of the invention's server code made <u>prior to</u> the September 14, 2000 priority date of Carroll.
- Exhibit (a) An email correspondence to persons other than the inventors of the fishing the internal address for accessing, and instructions on how to use, the working protopps system created and used by the inventors prior 1g September 14, 2000 priority data of Carroll and demonstrating features of the presently claimed Invention.
- Exhibit H) An email correspondence with reviewer feedback on the working prototype system created and used by the inventors <u>prior to</u> the September 14, 2000 priority date of Carroll and demonstrating features of the presently claimed invention.
- Exhibit ) Copies of several screenshots of the working prototype system or agried and used by the Inventors gator 16 September 14, 2000 priorly date of Carroll and demonstrating features of the presently claimed invention. These screenshots show lists of XML documents having content objects and content fragments which are named and linked through the entry felicis.
- Exhibit J) A copy of a section of the source code file that was created and

>> 561 989 9812

used by the inventors <u>prior to</u> September 14, 2000 priority date of Carroll and that implemented part of a working prototype system that performed features of the presently claimed invention.

5) The evidence submitted herewith supports the reduction to practice. The following table is submitted to show how each claim element is supported and that the test results unequivocally establish this software existed and worked for its intended ourpose.

Claim1 is an example. The other independent claims (18, 23, & 39) recite identical limitations.

Claim 1: A method on an information processing unit for performing steps for assembling, with a user interface (UI), a document that conforms to a particular document type definition, the method comprising:

receiving a user selection for a document type	Exhibit B, page 3, step 2.3, describes the step of creating the appropriate fragment.	
selecting one of a plurality of document type definition types based upon the document type received;	Exhibit A, pages 9-10 is the definition process of a typical DTD; step 6 refers to attributes of user input needed, e.g. "string" or "longtext"; and Exhibit A, page 13-14, shows an example of a servable DTD.	
parsing one or more of a plurality of elements in the document type definition type selected;	Exhibit A shows the plurality of elements in a DTD. Pages 9-10 refer to the UI types, ie, requirements for user input and Pages 13-14 show an example of a servable DTD.	
mapping each of the plurality of elements to one or more interface controls;	Exhibit A—The mapping from a DTD DATATYPE to Java widget control—is shown on page 25. Pages 9-10, step 6, Item 5, shows how lists of elements could be specified. Page 12 illustrates the description of a UITYPE that produces a file browser.	
presenting a UI editor by assembling the one or more interface controls so that the presentation of the UI editor is free from specific document type definition syntax;	Exhibit I: (Image resource) and (image fragment) show the results of assembling the interface controls. The Images shown in exhibit I are actual screen shots of that represented in FIGs. 9 and 8 of the Instant application. The specific syntax of XML is hidden from the user/leditor thus simplifying the interface.	

receiving a user input for content objects that are associated with the Interface controls; and	Exhibit B: page 3, scenario 1 and 2, Evaluation of Frankin & Kitryhawk describes how the user creates a fragment and a servable from the user interface wriggets that were created.
aggregating the content objects	Exhibit A: page 43 describes the page
associated with the interface controls to	assembler that aggregates the content
assemble a document that conforms to the	from multiple xml documents and creates
document type definition type selected.	the HTML using XSL stylesheets.

We, the undersigned, declare all of the above statements are made on our own knowledge, the above statements are true and commod, and the above statements are made on information that we believe to be true. We understand that false statements or concealment in obtaining a platent will subject us to line end/or improvement or both (18 U.S.C. \$1001) and may jeopardize the validity of the above identified patent application or any application issuing therefore.



### IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

09/748,716 Confirmation No. 5358

Appl. No. Applicant Sara Flo DFAN et al.

December 22 2000 Filed TC/A II 2173

Rrian J. DETWILER Evaminer POUG920000205US1 Docket No.

23334 Customer No.

# 37 C.F.R. 1.131 DECLARATION ·

i. each and every one of the undersigned inventors of the above-referenced patent application, hereby declare the following:

- Claims 1-9, 11-31, and 33-39 in our above-identified patent application were 1) relected under 35 U.S.C. \$102(e) and claims 10 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0085020 A1 to Carroll, Jr., entitled "XML-Based Graphical User Interface Application Development Toolkit" filed on September 14, 2001, with a priority date of September 14, 2000 ("Carroll").
- The invention described in the above-referenced patent application was reduced 2) to a writing prior to the September 14, 2000 priority date of Carroll. In particular. Franklin Content Management Prototype documentation (exhibit A), upon which the above referenced patent application was based, is attached herewith. The documentation is a comprehensive specification and installation of the inventive system (see the table of contents of this document for the full detail) created and used by the inventors prior to the September 14, 2000 priority date of Carroll and demonstrating features of the presently claimed invention. It includes everything from an Installation guide, configuration, setup of the DB and a Franklin workspace for content management, setting up of users, roles, and includes code spinners of communication between components and error codes.
  - Additionally, the invention described in the above-referenced patent application was reduced to actual practice prior to the September 14, 2000 priority date of Carmil. Proof of actual reduction to practice upon which the presently claimed invention was based is attached herewith and will be described in detail below.
- Submitted herewith as evidence of actual reduction to practice prior to the 4) September 14, 2000 priority date of Carroll are the following exhibits:
  - Exhibit B) Assignments passed out to users prior to the September 14, 2000 priority date of Carroll to test users who were evaluating the integration between two systems: the present invention and

"Kittyhawir giór, to the September 14, 2000 priority date of Carroll. The scenarios ask users to do different actions in the present invention's UI, which would show that there was a running system that could support users <u>prior to</u> the September 14, 2000 priority date of Carroll. The document describes the integration of the two systems, and shows the requestivesponses part of the communication between the two systems.

- Exhibit C) A copy of a State chart of the invention's D8 with each possible state of a fragment when stored in the invention's D8. The State chart was created and used by the inventions gring to the September 14, 2000 prority date of Carroll and demonstrates features of the presently calamed invention.
- Exhibit D Copies of HTML pages created by the inventors <u>prior t</u> by the Speember 14, 2000 Cyntrily date of Caroll and demonstrating features of the presently claimed invention. The HTML pages describe to seen bow to Install the inventive claim and command to manage documents, such as Oheck in, Chock out, or the Charles of the Trages of the Carolland and Carolland
- Exhibit: A synthesis of all frechtack from a user acceptance testing of the time tention, nun gior, bit to September 14, 2000 priority date of Carroll. It includes a list of things users liked and did not like, which evidences that users were using the tunning end-o-end inventive system with features of the presently claimed invention <u>prior to</u> the September 14, 2000 priority date of carroll.
- Exhibit F) A copy of brief notes identified during a code review of the invention's server code made prior to the September 14, 2000 priority date of Carroll.
- Exhibit G) An email correspondence to persons other than the inventors of the sense invention, faining the internal address for accessing, and instructions on how to use, the working protolype system created and used by the inventors gainty to September 14, 2000 priority date of Carroll and demonstrating issuarues of the presently claimed invention.
- Exhibit H) An email correspondence with reviewer feedback on the working prototype system created and used by the Inventors <u>prior to</u> the September 14, 2000 priority date of Carroll and demonstrating features of the presently claimed invention.
- Exhibit | Copies of several screen-shots of the working prototype system of the property of the property of the property of the presented (and used by the Inventors prior to September 14, 2000 priority date of Carroll and demonstrating features of the presently dated invention. These screen-shots show list of XML documents having content objects and content regements which are named and linked through the error feetile.
- Exhibit J) A copy of a section of the source code file that was created and

used by the inventors <u>prior to</u> September 14, 2000 priority date of Carroll and that implemented part of a working prototype system that performed features of the presently claimed invention.

5) The evidence submitted herewith supports the reduction to practice. The following table is submitted to show how each claim element is supported and that the test results unequivocally establish this software existed and worked for its intended purpose.

Claim1 is an example. The other independent claims (18, 23, & 39) recite identical limitations.

Claim 1: A method on an information processing unit for performing steps for assembling, with a user interface (UI), a document that conforms to a particular document two definition, the method comprising:

receiving a user selection for a document type	Exhibit B, page 3, step 2.3, describes the step of creating the appropriate fragment.
selecting one of a plurality of document type definition types based upon the document type received;	Exhibit A, pages 9-10 is the definition process of a typical DTD; step 6 refers to attributes of user input needed, e.g. "string" or "longtext"; and Exhibit A, page 13-14, shows an example of a servable DTD.
parsing one or more of a plurality of elements in the document type definition type selected;	Exhibit A shows the piurality of elements in a DTD. Pages 9-10 refor to the UI types, ie, requirements for user input and Pages 13-14 show an example of a servable DTD.
mapping each of the plurality of elements to one or more interface controls;	Exhibit A—The mapping from a DTD DATATYPE to Java widejet control—is shown on page 25. Pages 9-10, step 6, item 5, shows how lists of elements could be specified. Page 12 liustrates the description of a UITYPE that produces a file browser.
presenting a UI editor by assembling the one or more interface controls so that the presentation of the UI editor is free from specific document type definition syntax;	Exhibit I: (image resource) and (image fragment) show the results of assembling the interface controls. The images shown in exhibit I are actual screen shots of that represented in FIGs. 9 and 8 of the instant application. The specific syntax of XML is hidden from the user/editor thus simplifying the interface.

P 4/4

receiving a user input for content objects that are associated with the interface controls; and	Exhibit B: page 3, scenario 1 and 2, Evaluation of Franklin & Kithyhawk describes how the user creates a fragment and a servable from the user interface widgets that were created.
aggregating the content objects	Exhibit A: page 43 describes the page
associated with the interface controls to	assembler that aggregates the content
assemble a document that conforms to the	from multiple xml documents and creates
document type definition type selected.	the HTML using XSL stylesheets.

We, the undersigned, declare all of the above statements are made on our own knowledge, the above statements are true and correct, and the above statements are made on Information that we believe to be true. We understand that false statements or concealment in obtaining a patent will subject us to fine and/or imprisonment or both (18 U.S.C. §1001) and may jeopardize the validity of the above identified patent application or any application issuing therefrom.

	Saw Chilean	
Louis WEITZMAN	Sara ELO DEAN	Dikran S. MELIKSETIAN
Mayl 2006	May <u>9</u> 2008	May, 2006

### IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Appl. No. : 09/748,716
Applicant : Sara Elo DEAN et al.

Confirmation No. 5358

Applicant : Sara Elo DEAN et al. Flied : December 22, 2000 TC/A.U. : 2173

Examiner : Brian J. DETWILER
Docket No. : POUG920000205US1

Customer No. : 23334

## 37 C.F.R. 1.131 DECLARATION

I, each and every one of the undersigned inventors of the above-referenced patent application, hereby declare the following:

- 1) Claims 1-9, 11-31, and 33-39 in our above-identified patent application were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 100(e) and claims 10 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 100(e) based on U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0005020 A1 to Caroll, Jr., entitled "XVII-Based Graphical User Interface Application Development Toolik" filed on September 14, 2001, with a priority date of September 14, 2000 ("Caroll A").
- 2) The invention described in the above-referenced patient application was reduced to a wirting point to the Seyhember 14, 2000 pointy date of Carmoll. In particular, Franklin Content Management Prototype documentation (exhibit A), upon which the above referenced patient application was based, is attached herewith. The documentation is a comprehensive specification and installation of the inventive system (see the table of contents of this document for the full detail) created and used by the inventions grids to the September 14, 2000 printly date of Carroll and demonstrating features of the presently defined invention. It includes everything workspace for content management, settling up of users, roles, and includes code sprinceds for content management, settling up of users, roles, and includes code sprinceds for communication between compropers and error codes.
- 3) Additionally, the invention described in the above-referenced patent application was reduced to actual practice <u>prior to</u> the September 14, 2000 priority date of Carroll. Proof of actual reduction to practice upon which the presently claimed invention was based is attached herewith and will be described in detail below.
- Submitted herewith as evidence of actual reduction to practice prior to the September 14, 2000 priority date of Carroll are the following exhibits;
  - Exhibit B) Assignments passed out to users <u>prior to</u> the September 14, 2000 priority date of Carroll to test users who were evaluating the integration between two systems; the present invention and

"Kithhawit' <u>prior, to</u> the September 14, 2000 priority date of Carroll. The scenarios ask users to do different actions in the present inventions UI, which would show that there was a running system that could support users <u>prior to</u> the September 14, 2000 priority date of Carroll. The document describes the integration of the two systems, and shows the request/responses part of the communication between the two systems.

- Exhibit C) A copy of a State chart of the Invention's DB with each possible state of a fragment when stored in the invention's DB. The State chart was created and used by the Inventiors prior just be September 14, 2000 priority date of Carroll and demonstrates features of the presently claimed invention.
- Exhibit ) Cooles of HTML pages created by the inventors <u>proc. to</u> the September 14, 2000 priority date of Carroll and demonstrating features of the presently claimed invention. The HTML pages describe to users how to Install the inventive client and issue commands to manage documents, such as Check in, Check out, review, publish and describes the fragment/senable relationship to
- Exhibit: A synthesis of all feedback from a user acceptance testing of the leminon, run ginz, the September 14, 2000 priority date of Carrol. It includes a fist of things users lixed and did not like, which evidences that users were using the running and-to-ent inventive system with features of the presently claimed invention prior to the September 14, 2000 priority date of Carrollons.
- Exhibit F) A copy of brief notes identified during a code review of the invention's server code made <u>prior to</u> the September 14, 2000 priority date of Carroll.
- Exhibit G) An email correspondence to persons other than the inventors of the first proper timentification the Internet address for accessing, and instructions on how to use, the working prototype system created and used by the inventors <u>plant is September 14</u>, 2009 priority date of Carroll and demonstrating features of the presently claimed Invention.
- Exhibit H) An email correspondence with reviewer feedback on the working prototype system created and used by the inventors <u>prior to</u> the September 14, 2000 priority date of Carroll and demonstrating features of the presently claimed invention.
- Exhibit | Copies of several screenholts of the working portolype: system or matted and used by the inventoring profice 15 september 14, 2000 priority date of Carroll and demonstrating features of the presently claimed invention. These screenholts show list of XML documents having content objects and content fragments which are named and linked through the entry flexibity.
- Exhibit J) A copy of a section of the source code file that was created and

used by the inventors prior to September 14, 2000 priority date of Carroll and that implemented part of a working prototype system that performed features of the presently claimed invention.

5) The evidence submitted herewith supports the reduction to practice. The following table is submitted to show how each claim element is supported and that the test results unequivocally establish this software existed and worked for its intended purpose.

Claim1 is an example. The other independent claims (18, 23, & 39) recite identical limitations.

Claim 1: A method on an information processing unit for performing steps for assembling, with a user interface (UI), a document that conforms to a particular document type definition, the method comprising:

receiving a user selection for a document type	Exhibit B, page 3, step 2.3, describes the step of creating the appropriate fragment.
selecting one of a plurality of document type definition types based upon the document type received;	Exhibit A, pages 9-10 is the definition process of a typical DTD; step 6 refers to attributes of user input needed, e.g. "string" or "longtext"; and Exhibit A, page 13-14, shows an example of a servable DTD.
parsing one or more of a plurality of elements in the document type definition type selected;	Exhibit A shows the plurality of elements in a DTD. Pages 9-10 refer to the UI types, ie, requirements for user Input and Pages 13-14 show an example of a servable DTD.
mapping each of the plurality of elements to one or more interface controls;	Exhibit AThe mapping from a DTD DATATYPE to Java widget control—Is shown on page 25. Pages 9-10, step 6, item 5, shows how lists of elements could be specified. Page 12 illustrates the description of a UITYPE that produces a file browser.
presenting a UI editor by assembling the one or more interface controls so that the presentation of the UI editor is free from specific document type definition syntax;	Exhibit I: (image resource) and (image fragment) show the results of assembling the interface controls. The images shown in exhibit are actual screen shots of that represented in FIGs. 9 and 8 of the instant application. The specific syntax of XML is hidden from the user/editor thus simplifying the interface.

th	ceiving a user input for content objects at are associated with the interface ontrols; and	Exhibit B: page 3, scenario 1 and 2, Evaluation of Frankiln & Kittyhawk describes how the user creates a fragment and a servable from the user interface widgets that were created.
as	ggregating the content objects sociated with the Interface controls to semble a document that conforms to the ocument type definition type selected.	Exhibit A: page 43 describes the page assembler that aggregates the content from multiple xml documents and creates the HTML using XSL stylesheets.

We, the undersigned, declare all of the above statements are made on our own knowledge, the above statements are true and consect, and the above statements are made or information that we believe to be true. We understand that false statements or concealment in challing a patient will absplect us for he and/or improvement or both (18 U.S.C. §1001) and may jeopardize the validity of the above identified patient application or any application issuing thereiron.

		D. Williamian
Louis WEITZMAN	Sara ELO DEAN	Dikran S. MELIKSETIAN
Mayi, 2006	May, 2006	May, 2006